

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE
PARASITOLOGY (CREATING)
WINDHES FARM.
336, HATFIELD ROAD
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

VOLUME 9. Part 8
pp. 223-254

11th May 1954

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

11 MAY 1954

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by
FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

<i>Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology :</i>	Page
Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the <i>Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature</i>	223
Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases	224

(continued on back wrapper)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence
(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History),
Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.,
U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th
August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent
re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The
Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th
July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*)
(27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) (9th
June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences,
Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg,
Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität
zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-
President*)

Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August
1953)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th
August 1953) (*President*)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland,
U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Professor Béla Hankó (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York,
N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th
August 1953)

Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Nether-
lands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 8 (pp. 223-254)

11th May 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission may start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (Vol. 9, Part 8) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (continued)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

1. NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers, is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

- (1) Geoffroy, 1762, *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*, proposed validation of the following six names published in, for genera of the Order Diptera: *Stratiomys*, *Stomoxys*, *Volucella*, *Nemotelus*, *Scatopse*, *Bibio* (Z.N.(S.)710) ;
- (2) *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Cl. Amphibia), proposed suppression of (Z.N.(S.)594) ;
- (3) *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, proposed designation of a neotype for, and *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (Cl. Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed designation of a type species for (Z.N.(S.)631).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin* : other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications *Nature* and *Science*.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature.*

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

11th May 1954

**RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PROPOSED
SUPPRESSION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, OF THE
GENERIC NAMES IN THE ORDER DIPTERA (CLASS
INSECTA) BY MEIGEN PUBLISHED IN 1800 IN THE "NOU-
VELLE CLASSIFICATION DES MOUCHES A DEUX AILES"**

By CURTIS W. SABROSKY

*(United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant
Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)*

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)191)

(Enclosure to letter dated 9th October 1952)

Following the publication on 15th April 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6**: 131-141) of my paper entitled "Meigen, 1800: A proposal for stability and uniformity," I distributed separates of that paper to 370 publishing dipterists throughout the world, together with a Questionnaire (annexed to the present paper as Appendix 1) designed to elicit their views on the action which it was desirable should be taken on the Meigen problem and a covering "statement" (annexed to the present paper as Appendix 2). The above documents were mailed in May 1952.

At the time of this summary (October 9th 1952), replies had been received from 188 or 51 per cent. In order to show in a general way the distribution of the questionnaires and replies, seven divisions were adopted, as indicated in Table 1 and succeeding tables.

The answers to questions one to five are summarised below in Tables 2 and 3. For all questions there were some blanks, and a few replies that could not readily be entered in the summaries. These non-classifiable answers, scattered throughout the geographical divisions, totalled 17 on the first question, 25 on the second, 24 on the third, 5 on the fourth, and 18 on the fifth. Question 6 is a general question which is not directly pertinent to the application and has been summarised separately.

The summary is of course based only on those who replied specifically to the questionnaire, either by its return or by a letter relating to it. Of those who did not reply, some are known to use and favour the 1803 names and some the 1800 names. For many others, their present usage or preference is unknown to me. One can only assume that the reactions in the half that did not reply do not differ materially from those in the half that did.

Table 1. Distribution of Questionnaires and Replies

Country or Region	Number Sent	Number of Replies	Per Cent. Replies
United States* and Canada ..	112	71	63
Latin America†	49	19	39
Great Britain	41	24	59
Continental Europe‡	95	42	44
Africa	25	12	48
Asia§	30	10	33
Australasia	18	10	56
Totals	370	188	51

* Including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Panama Canal Zone. Fifteen were sent to Canada, with nine replies; balance to United States and its possessions.

† Questionnaires to 12 countries, the largest numbers to Brazil (26), Argentine (5) and Venezuela (5).

‡ Questionnaires to 17 countries, with greatest numbers to Germany (18), France (12), Netherlands and Belgium (21), and Scandinavia (15). Replies from 12 countries, with greatest numbers from Germany (14), Netherlands and Belgium (8), and Scandinavia (5).

§ Including the Philippines.

Table 2. Summary of Replies to Questions 1 to 5 in Questionnaire (Appendix 2)

Table 2 (Continued)

Source	Question 4			Question 5			
	Yes	No	Per Cent. Yes	Yes on Question 4		No on Question 4	
				Would Change	Would Not	Would Change	Would Not
United States and Canada	60	10	86	47	10	9	1
Latin America	17	2	89	10	2	2	—
Great Britain	24	—	100	14	6	—	—
Continental Europe	26	13	67	18	8	10	3
Africa	11	1	92	9	1	1	—
Asia	7	2	78	6	—	2	—
Australasia	10	—	100	9	1	—	—
Totals	155	28	85	113	28	24	4

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE QUESTIONS

Question 1: Four-fifths (80 per cent.) of the 171 who replied to this question indicated that their special fields of research involve the disputed Meigen 1800 names, and they may therefore be presumed to be familiar with and concerned with the controversy. Still others are also directly involved, of course, because they use the names in teaching or in identification services, as was brought out in questions 2(b) and 2(c).

Question 2: Of the total of 163 replies to this question, 114 or 70 per cent. stated that they now use the 1803 names, and 49 or 30 per cent. the 1800 names. It is interesting to note that in the two largest divisions, the United States and Canada (61 replies) and Continental Europe (38 replies), the per cent. of authors using 1803 names is a little over half (59 and 53 per cent., respectively). On the other hand, the combined figures for the rest of the world show 64 replies to this question, with 58 or 91 per cent. indicating 1803 usage.

Question 3: Of the 166 replies, 125 showed no change in usage (107 with 1803 usage, 18 with 1800 usage). Thirty-two authors (22 of them in the United States and Canada) indicated that they had changed from 1803 to 1800, all of those in the United States and Canada changing after 1937 and nine of these after 1945. However, it should be noted that one of the nine changed back to 1803 names after one year, and another used 1800 names in one paper in 1952 through editorial policy rather than personal preference. Nine authors had changed from 1800 to 1803, at least six of these changing since 1945.

Question 4: This key question, on approval or disapproval of the application to suppress the 1800 paper, elicited 183 replies. 155 (85 per cent.) supported the proposal, and 28 (15 per cent.) opposed it.

It may be of interest to compare the replies with those to the second question, as follows:

Table 3. Comparison of Replies received to Question 2 and Question 4 respectively

Source	Question 2			Question 4		
	1803	1800	Per cent. 1803	Yes	No	Per cent. Yes
United States and Canada	36	25	59	60	10	86
Continental Europe ..	20	18	53	26	13	67
The rest of the world ..	58	6	91	69	5	93
Totals ..	114	49	70	155	28	85

Thus, in the two geographical divisions in which 1803 and 1800 usages are closest, 59 per cent. and 53 per cent. of the workers currently are using the 1803 names, but 86 per cent. and 67 per cent., respectively, support the proposal

to suppress the 1800 paper. This willingness on the part of a number of workers to vote against their own current usage may reflect a desire to settle the question in the direction of the predominant usage (as reported in my application), a willingness to go along with the majority, or a willingness to change because their own change to 1800 usage was so recent that no great amount of literature has resulted and no confirmed habit has been fixed. In the rest of the world, with 91 per cent. 1803 usage, the proposal is supported by 93 per cent. of the replies.

Question 5: There were 169 replies to this question, 141 by those who answered Question 4 in the affirmative and 28 by those who answered it in the negative. Of the 141 affirmative votes on the proposal, 113 or 80 per cent. would nevertheless agree to adopt the 1800 names if the Commission decided in their favour. Twenty-eight (20 per cent.) said they would not change. Of the 28 negative votes on the proposal, 24 (86 per cent.) would change to the 1803 names if the Commission decided in their favour, while 4 (14 per cent.) would not change. Thus on each side the percentage of those who would not change is not greatly different.

It is indeed unfortunate that some workers decline to follow the Commission and majority opinion, whichever way these might go, for it means that we shall continue to have a certain amount of annoying and senseless confusion. Percentagewise, both sides are about the same; numerically, those who oppose the proposal and would refuse to change are fewer in number (4). In a practical sense, therefore, suppression of the 1800 paper would result in less confusion in the sense of leaving fewer authors as exceptions to the majority practice. On the other hand, a number of the "1803" supporters who will not change are old or retired, and perhaps refusal to change should not be given too much weight in considering the best step for the future.

AUTHORS' COMMENTS

Most authors replied to the questionnaire without comment. Among those who did comment, there were a number of enthusiastic expressions of approbation, of pleasure at a prospect of resolving the confusion, and of hope that the conflicting usage in Diptera could be ended, one way or the other. There were also several comments in some detail from supporters of the 1800 names who opposed the application, and almost all of these are thoughtful, considered statements of general principle which can be commended, and which should be given their due consideration by the International Commission, even though they represent a minority vote in this survey.

Appendices

The names and addresses of all the dipterists who, in replying to the Questionnaire, stated (a) that they were in favor of the proposed suppression of the "Meigen 1800" names and (b) that they were opposed to the foregoing proposal are given in Appendix 3 in Lists A and B respectively. In the same Appendix there is given in List C particulars of those authors who, in reply to Question 3 of the Questionnaire, stated that at one time or another they had changed their usage as between the "1800" and "1803" names respectively. In Appendix 4 a summary is given of the reactions of dipterists to changing family names *only* when type genera are found to be homonyms (Question 6).

APPENDIX 1

Text of Questionnaire issued in May 1952

QUESTIONNAIRE ON MEIGEN 1800

May 1952

The enclosed proposal is at once a comment on several individual cases already published (*Bull. zool. Nomen.*) and an all-inclusive counter-proposal. You are earnestly requested and urged to answer the questions below and to send this page as soon as possible to Mr. Curtis W. Sabrosky, Bureau of Entomology & Plant Quarantine, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C., who has undertaken, at the request of Secretary Hemming, to assemble and tabulate the replies for the Commission. It is assumed that your name may be listed in the summary. Any comments you wish to make may also be quoted unless you request otherwise. If any dipterists do not receive this material, through unfortunate oversight or unknown address, copies may be had from Mr. Sabrosky.

1. Do your special fields of research involve disputed Meigen 1800 names (including the family names affected)?.....(Yes or No.) (Note: If your answer is No, you may still be interested in later questions.)

2. Which do you now use, the 1800 or the 1803 names?

- (a) In publishing.....(1800 or 1803 ?) (Answer any or all ques-
 (b) In teaching.....(1800 or 1803 ?) tions as appropriate.)
 (c) In identification or other services.....(1800 or 1803 ?)

3. If you have changed usage during your professional career, which way did you change and when.....(1800 to 1803) in.....
 (1803 to 1800)

4. Do you vote for the present proposal to suppress the Meigen 1800 paper ?
(Yes or No).

5. (a) If your answer to 4 is No, would you nevertheless change to the 1803 names, if the Commission should decide in their favour because of preponderant literature, and if a significant majority of dipterists favour them ?
(Yes or No).

(b) If your answer to 4 is Yes, would you nevertheless agree to adopt the 1800 names if the Commission should decide in their favour after considering the principles, the evidence, and the results of this questionnaire?.....
 (Yes or No).

6. A general question, whose solution would remove one objection to 1800 names, especially among teachers: Would you favour a general rule to require changing a family name *only* when the type genus is found to be a homonym, and not when it becomes a synonym?.....(Yes or No). (Example: *Larvaevora* 1800 could be accepted, with *Tachina* 1803 in synonymy, but the family name Tachinidae would not need to be changed.)

.....
 Signature.

APPENDIX 2

Statement distributed with the Questionnaire reproduced in
Appendix 1

I have been concerned for many years with the conflicting usage of the Meigen names in Diptera, the nuisance of explaining it to students, non-dipterists, economic entomologists, and zoologists, and the sterility and futility of the seemingly endless discussions about it. As far as the names themselves are concerned (and I have used both sets of names at various periods of my work), I am not a protagonist for either 1800 or 1803 names; rather, and above all, I wish the dispute settled once and for all, and be done with it. Whatever the solution may be, let us adopt it. If 1800, then let all change to those names promptly and completely, and achieve respectable stability and uniformity in the eyes of fellow entomologists and zoologists and biologists. If 1803, let us equally manfully change to those names to the same admirable ends. In other words, let us dipterists put our house in order!

Some may complain that the Commission has already passed upon a similar application, after a questionnaire conducted in 1932 by F. W. Edwards. However, that questionnaire showed that of the eighty-eight dipterists who replied to it ("including a very high percentage of the working dipterists of the world"), 87 per cent. were opposed to the 1800 names, but despite that fact the *ad hoc* committee of the Entomological Congress at Paris (1932) voted four to two (exactly in line with the way the individual members of the committee voted on the questionnaire!) in favour of a contrary resolution that "This section is of the opinion that more confusion would result by now rejecting the generic names" of Meigen 1800 "than by retaining them," and they therefore recommended their definite adoption. This resolution was later confirmed by the Congress. At Madrid in 1935, on a crowded agenda, the matter was passed on to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The latter had presented to it, in effect, a proposal that the 1800 names be adopted, coming from the Entomological Congress, to whose recommendations the I.C.Z.N. customarily gives great weight.

This history shows clearly the danger of a local or prejudiced majority—a danger that is inherent in all actions taken by International Congresses, for in 1932 the resolution of the Paris Congress could not have been supported by any evidence. It flatly contradicted the survey made by Edwards among working dipterists, and at that date, twenty years ago, it had no basis in usage in the literature. Kertész and Coquillett, two early supporters of the 1800 names, had died too soon after 1908 to leave much literature or to influence many workers; others such as Kieffer and Townsend had changed back from 1800 to 1803 names; Lindner's great series was less than a decade old, having begun in 1923; the "Faune de France" series had begun in 1924, but up to 1932, of the seven volumes that involved the disputed names, six used the 1803 names; the extensive American literature was overwhelmingly 1803, for Coquillett had died in 1910, E. P. Felt's activity was limited to one family, and J. M. Aldrich, a staunch 1803 advocate, dominated the American scene; and finally, the total amount of 1800 usage, measured against the backdrop of all literature from 1803 to 1908, and the bulk of that from 1908 to 1932 was insignificant.

One important point made by 1800 advocates is that to make this exception would weaken further the Law of Priority and would lower the bars for more and more exceptions. This argument is very appealing. However, the history of the International Commission shows so many exceptions already that it is difficult to see how this one case by itself can be regarded as "lowering the bars." Furthermore, it is not my intention, and I hope that the case will not be so used by others, to use it as a precedent for making further exceptions in individual cases. Rather, because the Meigen 1800 paper is so far-reaching and important, and has been such a *bête noire* in Diptera, I believe that it should be considered as a case by itself, completely without prejudice to individual situations which are so often of such minor importance or limited application that the Law of Priority should be used without hesitation. If my application is used as a precedent in any way, it should be this: Any application should furnish full documentation and evidence of consequence, and not merely echo the cliché that greater confusion than uniformity would result if a certain decision were not made.

I can also report the results of a survey of recent usage in papers reported in the latest volume (1951) of the Bibliography of Agriculture. This adds one year to the survey reported in Table 2 of my paper. Of ninety-one taxonomic publications, 62 per cent. used 1803 names; of thirty-nine non-taxonomic, 82 per cent. used 1803; the totals: 130 papers, 68 per cent. with 1803 names. Of the ninety-seven authors of these 1930 papers, 72 per cent. used 1803 names. In each column, this represents a decrease from 1950, though in some cases slight. There are several points here: It was a year of considerable activity by such 1800 authors as D. E. Hardy and W. W. Wirth, and of little activity by such 1803 authors as C. P. Alexander and H. Oldroyd; the percentage of taxonomic papers has fluctuated since 1939 (Table 2), probably reflecting the relative activity of various authors; the percentage of authors using 1803 names shows a steady decline since 1939, though the difference between 1939 and 1952 is still slight. One might argue interminably about significance and trends and time element; the fact remains that the percentages of 1803 usage are still high. Furthermore, these refer largely to current periodical literature, and one must still consider the high proportion of 1803 usage represented in the major works (Table 1).

Reprints of the enclosed application were furnished through the courtesy of Secretary Hemming and the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, in order to make the circularisation of interested persons as complete and far-reaching as possible.

Curtis W. Sabrosky

APPENDIX 3**Names and addresses of dipterists replying to the Questionnaire****A. REPLIES IN FAVOUR OF THE PROPOSAL THAT THE
MEIGEN "1800" NAMES SHOULD BE SUPPRESSED****United States and Canada**

- Alexander, C. P., U. of Mass., Amherst, Mass.
 Arnaud, Paul H., Jr., 60 Woodrow St., Redwood City, Calif.
 Belkin, J. N., U. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Bellamy, R. E., U.S. Public Health Service, Bakersfield, Calif.
 Bequaert, J., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
 Blanton, F. S., Ft. Clayton, Panama Canal Zone
 Bohart, Geo. E., U.S. Bureau Ent. & Plant Quar., Logan, Utah
 Bohart, R. M., Univ. of California, Davis, Calif.
 Breland, O. P., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas
 Brookman, Bernard, U.S. Public Health Service, Bakersfield, Calif.
 Brooks, A. R., Dominion Ent. Lab., Saskatoon, Sask., Canada
 Brues, C. T., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. (retired)
 Camras, Sidney, 4407 N. Milwaukee Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Coher, E. I., Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
 Cole, Frank R., P.O. Box 6, Redlands, Calif.
 Curran, C. H., American Museum of Natural History, New York, N.Y.
 Dalmat, H. T., U.S. Public Health Service, Guatemala City, Guatemala
 Davies, D. M., McMaster Univ., Hamilton, Ont., Canada
 Dodge, H. R., U.S. Public Health Service, Chamblee, Georgia
 Fairchild, G. B., Gorgas Memorial Lab., Ancon, Panama Canal Zone
 Ferris, G. F., Stanford Univ., Stanford, Calif.
 Fluke, C. L., Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Freeborn, S. B., Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Frick, K. E., Irrigation Experiment Station, Prosser, Wash.
 Hall, D. G., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.
 Hull, F. M., Univ. of Mississippi, University, Miss.
 James, M. T., Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.
 Johannsen, O. A., Cornell Univ. (retired), Ithaca, N.Y.
 King, W. V., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Orlando, Fla.
 Komp, W. H. W., U.S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.
 Laffoon, J. L., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
 Malloch, J. R., P.O. Box 1925, Tampa, Fla. (retired)
 Martin, Charles H., Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore.
 Matheson, R., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. (retired)
 Middlekauff, W. W., Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Nicholson, H. P., 5020 Hildon Road, Chamblee, Georgia
 Painter, R. H., Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.
 Patterson, J. T., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas
 Philip, C. B., U.S. Public Health Service, Hamilton, Mont.
 Pritchard, A. E., Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, Calif.
 Quate, L. M., Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Rapp, W. F., Jr., Doane College, Crete, Nebr.
 Reinhard, H. J., Texas A & M College, College Station, Texas

- Roback, S. S., Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Penn.
Rogers, J. S., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Rozeboom, L. E., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
Sabrosky, C. W., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.
Saunders, L. G., Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask., Canada
Schlinger, E. I., Univ. of California, Davis, Calif.
Shaw, F. R., Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
Snyder, F. M., 5604 Woodmont Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Spencer, G. J., Univ. of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Steyskal, G. C., 27253 West River Road, Grosse Isle, Mich.
Strickland, E. H., Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Sturtevant, A. H., California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.
Thompson, W. R., Commonwealth Bureau of Biological Control, Ottawa, Ont.,
Canada
Weems, H. V., Jr., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio
Wenzel, R. L., Chicago Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill.
West, L. S., Northern Michigan College of Education, Marquette, Michigan
Wheeler, M. R., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas
Zimmerman, E. C., Sugar Planters' Assn. Experiment Station, Honolulu,
Hawaii

Latin America

- d'Andretta, M. A. Vulcano, Dept. de Zoologia, Sec. de Agricultura, Sao Paulo,
Brazil
Anduze, Pablo J., Museo de Ciencias Naturales, Caracas, Venezuela
Barretto, M. P., Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Carrera, Messias, Dept. Zool., Sec. de Agricultura, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Correa, R. R., Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Cortés, P. Raúl, Ministerio de Agricultura, Santiago, Chile
Fernandez-Yepez, F., Division de Entomologia, Maracay, Est. Aragua,
Venezuela
Fonseca, J. Pinto da, Instituto Biologico, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Forattini, O. P., Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Galvao, A. L. Ayrosa, Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Lane, John, Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Lima, A. da Costa, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Martinez Palacios, A., Instituto de Salubridad y Enfermedades Tropicales,
Mexico, D.F., Mexico
Senior-White, R. A., Malaria Division, Port of Spain, Trinidad
Stuardo, Carlos, Casilla 4019, Santiago, Chile
Vargas, Luis, Instituto de Salubridad y Enfermedades Tropicales, Mexico,
D.F., Mexico
Wygodzinsky, Petr, Universidad Nacional de Tucuman, Tucuman, Argentina

Great Britain

- Andrews, H. W., Christchurch, Hants., England
Barnes, H. F., Rothamsted Experiment Station, Harpenden, Herts., England

- Buxton, P. A., London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, England
 Christophers, Sir R., The Museums, Cambridge, England
 Clements, A. N., Trinity College, Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, England
 Coe, R. L., British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London, England
 Collin, J. E., Raylands, Newmarket, Suffolk, England
 Day, C. D., Dorchester, Dorset, England
 Downes, J. A., Univ. of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland
 Emden, F. I. van, Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London, England
 Fonseca, E. C. M. d'Assis-, Henleaze, Bristol, England
 Freeman, Paul, British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London, England
 Grensted, L. W., Oriel College, Oxford Univ., Oxford, England
 Hobby, B. M., University Museum, Oxford Univ., Oxford, England
 Hopkins, G. H. E., Tring, Herts., England
 Jobling, B., Wellcome Labs. of Tropical Medicine, London, England
 Kettle, D. S., Univ. of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland
 Laurence, B. R., Luton, Beds., England
 Niblett, M., Wallington, Surrey, England
 Oldroyd, H., British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London, England
 Parmenter, L., Thornton Heath, Surrey, England
 Richards, O. W., Imperial College of Science and Technology, London, England
 Smart, John, Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, England
 Thomas, H. T., King's College Hospital Medical School, London, England

Continental Europe

- Benoit, P. L. G., Musée du Congo Belge, Tervuren, Belgium
 Bequaert, M., Gand, Belgium
 Brundin, Lars, Institute of Freshwater Research, Drottningholm, Sweden
 Collart, A., Musée Royal d'Histoire Naturelle, Bruxelles, Belgium
 Frey, R., Museum Zoologicum, Universitatis, Helsinki, Finland
 Ghesquière, J., Insectarium International, Menton (A.M.), France
 Keiser, Fred, Naturhistorisches Museum, Basle, Switzerland
 Kröber, O., Hudtwalckerstrasse 22hpt, Hamburg, Germany (retired)
 Kruseman, G., Jr., Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands
 Lengersdorf, F., 26 Combahnstrasse, Beuel-Bonn am Rhein, Germany
 Martini, E., Abendrotweg 21, Hamburg, Germany (retired)
 Mesnil, L. P., Commonwealth Bureau of Biological Control, 139 Seestrasse, Feldmeilen (Zürich), Switzerland
 Nielsen, Peder, Silkeborg, Denmark
 Peris, S. V., Estacion Experimental de "Aula Dei," Zaragoza, Spain
 Saccà, Giuseppe, Istituto Superiore di Sanita, Roma, Italy
 Sara, M. M., Istituto e Museo di Zoologia, Univ. di Napoli, Napoli, Italy
 Schmitz, H., Alosiuskolleg, Bad Godesberg, Germany
 Strenzke, K., Hydrobiologische Anstalt der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Plön, (Holstein), Germany
 Thienemann, A., Hydrobiologische Anstalt der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Plön (Holstein), Germany
 Tjeder, Bo, Falun, Sweden
 Tuomikoski, R. K., Temppeilik, 7, Helsinki, Finland
 Tuxen, S. L., Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, København, Denmark

- Vanschuytbroeck, Paul, Institut royal des Sciences naturelles de Belgique, Bruxelles, Belgium
Venturi, F., Istituto di Entomologia Agraria, Univ. di Pisa, Pisa, Italy
Verbeke, J., Commonwealth Bureau of Biological Control, Feldmeilen (Zürich), Switzerland
Weyer, Fritz, Institut für Schiffs und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg, Germany

Africa

- De Meillon, B., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa
Eflatoun, H. C., Faculty of Science, Fouad I University, Cairo, Egypt
Heinz, H. J., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa
Hesse, A. J., South African Museum, Cape Town, South Africa
Machado, A. de Barros, Museu do Dundo, Diamang, Angola
Munro, H. K., Dept. of Agriculture, Pretoria, Union of South Africa (comment indicated that the vote should be counted "Yes" in general)
Muspratt, J., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa
Parrot, L., Institut Pasteur d'Algerie, Algiers, Algeria
Paterson, H. A., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa
Vaillant, F., Université d'Alger, Algiers, Algeria
Zumpt, F., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa

Asia

- Baisas, F. E., Public Health Research Labs., Manila, Philippines
Esaki, Teiso, Kyushu Univ., Fukuoka, Japan
Kato, Schizuo, National Agricultural Research Institute, Tokyo, Japan
Lever, R. J. A. W., Dept. of Agriculture, Kuala Lumpur, Malaya
Menon, M. A. U., Public Health Lab., Trivandrum, Travancore, India
Nayar, K. K., University College, Trivandrum, Travancore, India
Reid, J. A., Institute for Medical Research, Kuala Lumpur, Malaya

Australasia

- Hardy, G. H., Katoomba, New South Wales (retired)
Harrison, R. A., Plant Diseases Division, Auckland, New Zealand
Lee, David J., School of Public Health, The University, Sydney, Australia
Lower, H. F., Univ. of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
Mackerras, I. M., Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane, Queensland
Marks, Miss E. N., University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
Norris, K. R., Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Canberra, A.C.T.
Paramonov, S. J., Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Canberra, A.C.T.
Salmon, J. T., Victoria Univ. College, Wellington, New Zealand
Satchell, G. H., Univ. of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
Womersley, H., South Australian Museum, Adelaide, Australia

B. REPLIES OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSAL**United States and Canada**

- Hardy, D. E., Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii
Kessel, E. L., Univ. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
McAlpine, J. F., Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Pechuman, L. L., 7 Davison Road, Lockport, N.Y.
Remington, C. L., Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
Shewell, G. E., Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Stone, Alan, U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.
Townes, H. K., North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C.
Vockeroth, J. R., Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Wirth, W. W., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.

Latin America

- Aezél, M., Instituto Miguel Lillo, Tucuman, Argentina
Barbosa, F. A. S., Instituto Aggeu Magalhães, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

Continental Europe

- d'Aguilar, J., Station Centrale de Zoologie Agricole, Versailles, France
Barendrecht, G., Zoologisch Laboratorium der Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Doesburg, P. H. van, Sr., Cantonlaan 1, Baarn, Netherlands
Dupuis, Claude, Laboratoire d'Helminthologie Coloniale et de Parasitologie Comparée, Paris, France
Hennig, Willi, Deutsches Entomologisches Institut, Berlin-Friedrichshagen, Germany
Laven, H., Bernhard-Nocht-Institut für Schiffs-und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg, Germany
Mannheims, Bernhard, Museum Alexander Koenig, Bonn (Rhein), Germany
Marcuzzi, G., Istituto di Zoologia, Univ. di Padova, Padova, Italy
Mayer, Karl, Biologische Zentralanstalt für Land und Forstwirtschaft, Kleinmachnow bei Berlin, Berlin, Germany
Peus, Fritz, Zoologisches Museum, Berlin, Germany
Sachtleben, H., Deutsches Entomologisches Institut, Berlin-Friedrichshagen, Germany
Séguy, E., Museum National d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, France
Theowald, Br., Stadhouderskade 60, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Africa

- Lumsden, W. H. R., Virus Research Institute, Entebbe, Uganda

Asia

- Okada, Toyohi, Tokyo Metropolitan Univ., Tokyo, Japan
Shiraki, Tokueichi, 20 Nagasaki-2 Chome, Tokyo, Japan

**C. AUTHORS WHO HAVE CHANGED USAGE
(QUESTION 3)**

Source	1803 to 1800		1800 to 1803	
	Name	Date Changed	Name	Date Changed
United States and Canada	Belkin	1942	Fluke	1950
	Bohart, G. E.	1945		
	Brookman	1946		
	Brooks	1942		
	Hall, D. G.	1938		
	Hardy, D. E.	1939		
	James	1941		
	Johannsen	1952		
	Kessel	1940		
	King	1941		
	Fluke	1949		
	Pechuman	1946		
	Philip	1937		
	Pritchard	1939		
	Remington	1943		
	Roback	1950		
	Sabrosky	1945		
	Snyder	1938-40		
	Steyskal	1951		
	Stone	1941		
	Shewell	"after the war"		
	Townes	1940		
Great Britain			Niblett	1949
			Oldroyd	By 1945
Continental Europe	Barendrecht	c. 1935	Collart	1939
	Dupuis	By 1951	Mesnil	1951
	Lengersdorf	1930	Vanschuytbroeck	1950
	Kröber	1910 ?		
	Mayer	1940		
	Nielsen, Peder	1932		
Africa	Soot-Ryen	c. 1930		
	Vaillant	"lately"	Ethiatoun	1945
Asia			Zumpt	?
	Okada	1936	Nayar	?
	Shiraki	1912		

APPENDIX 4**Reaction of dipterists to changing family names only when type genera are found to be homonyms (Question 6)**

A question (the question whether it would be desirable that a family name should be liable to change only when the name of its type was found to be a homonym—Question 6) was added to the Meigen questionnaire as a general question to sample opinion of a body of practising taxonomists in a group where the principle would be of importance. It is well illustrated by the family names based on Meigen 1803 names and their counterparts in the 1800 names. The point is not directly involved in the Meigen application, and some replies questioned whether the inclusion of the matter along with the survey would give a fair answer unprejudiced by attitudes on the controversial Meigen names. On the other hand, it might also be argued that the situation in Diptera involving the Meigen names and their associated family names is the best possible example of the value of having a rule that would avoid any more changes than are absolutely necessary.

Replies to the question (question 6 on the Meigen questionnaire) totalled 166, of which 114 or 69% replied that they favoured a general rule that required changing a family name *only* when the type genus is found to be a homonym, and not when it is found to be a synonym.

If the Meigen 1800 paper is suppressed, the point will not matter to dipterists, at least insofar as the 1800 vs. 1803 names are concerned. If the 1800 paper is not suppressed, then the point will be an important consideration.

The voting on the question was distributed as follows:

Summary of Answers received to Question 6

Source	Yes	No	Per cent. Yes
United States and Canada ..	48	17	74
Latin America	10	4	71
Great Britain	15	8	65
Continental Europe	21	15	58
Africa	9	2	82
Asia	4	4	50
Australasia	7	2	78
Totals	114	52	69

**A REQUEST FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS
TO PRESERVE THE GENERIC NAMES IN GEOFFROY
(1762) IN THE ORDER DIPTERA (CLASS INSECTA)**

By ALAN STONE, C. W. SABROSKY, W. W. WIRTH and R. H. FOOTE
(Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant
Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)710)

The decision of the Paris Congress to substitute the word "binominal" for the word "binary" in the Code, as applied retroactively to works that have long been accepted by taxonomists, will, in our opinion, cause many serious disturbances to stability and continuity. We accordingly disagree strongly with the decision taken at Paris, and feel that the previous wording of the Code, which has stood for nearly a half century, should have been left undisturbed. If problems existed in some groups, they could have been solved by exercise of the Plenary Powers of the Commission. However, we shall make no further issue of this, and we accept the decision, albeit reluctantly.

2. It becomes necessary, therefore, as the Commission itself has suggested (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 368), to consider in the Order Diptera the status of the generic names uniformly accepted by dipterists as dating from Geoffroy.

3. The publication of immediate concern to us is the *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*. All of the dipterous names occur in the second volume. This work was first published in 1762 without indication of authorship and republished in 1764 with Geoffroy given as the author. While some of the publications listed below have cited the names in question as from 1764, Sherborn (*Index Animalium*) adopted the date of 1762, and this is apparently correct. If a generic name is credited to Geoffroy, it must date back to 1762. As a matter of record, however, in the following list of references we indicate by (o) that no date was given, by (*) that the date 1764 was used, and by (!) that some other erroneous deviation from Geoffroy, 1762, was employed. Unmarked references cite the date correctly as 1762.

4. We have reviewed Geoffroy's entire work and find only thirteen generic names of Diptera. These are first listed on pages 447-448 with the French vernacular names, followed by a diagnosis of each in French, and then on pages 449-450 the Latin names followed by Latin diagnoses. There follows a section describing the genera more fully, with descriptions of the included species. These species are not named binominally, though some can be identified by the citations to the Linnaean species. Of the thirteen generic names, six are proposed for the first time in this publication. These are as follows:

(i) *Stratiomys* (: 449, 475). Eight species. Type species: *Musca chamacleon* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Latreille, 1810.

(ii) *Stomoxys* (: 449, 538). One species. Type species: *Conops calcitrans* Linnaeus, monobasic.

(iii) *Volucella* (: 449, 540). Three species. Type species: *Musca pellucens* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Curtis, 1833.

(iv) *Nemotelus* (: 450, 542). Two species. Type species: *Musca pantherina* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Latreille, 1810 (as *uliginosus* L. and *marginatus* L.).

(v) *Scatopse* (: 450 and as *Scathopse* : 544-545). Two species. Type species: *Tipula notata* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Latreille, 1810. (The spelling *Scatopse* is preferred because it is currently and universally accepted, it has predominated in past years, and it has page precedence in the original.)

(vi) *Bibio* (: 450, 568). Five species. Type species: *Tipula hortulana* Linnaeus, the third species, by selection of Latreille, 1810.

5. The overthrow of these common, widely used, and important generic names, which are the oldest in the Order Diptera next to the Linnaean names, would be most unfortunate and would upset or threaten stability in these long-established names. At the present time, and throughout virtually all the history of dipterology, the six names have been accepted as dating from Geoffroy, with rare exceptions that are in most cases undoubtedly lapses or typographical errors (e.g. Curran, 1927, and Walker, 1851, see below, under *Stratiomys* : Curran, 1934, see below under General Works). If the Geoffroy names were to be eliminated, the consequences shown in the four immediately following paragraphs would result :—

6. A laborious search of the literature after 1762 would have to be carried out in order to determine the next use of each of these six names that would be acceptable under the Code, with the realisation that validation by citation in synonymy might also occur. We can think of no more barren labour than such a search, which should have been totally unnecessary (see introductory paragraph) and is certainly unwanted and undesirable. The result of such a search would be to change the dates and authorship of the six names, changes which, though apparently not serious, would nevertheless mean incorrect citations for many years to come.

7. The change of date and authorship would raise the question of whether a type designation for a Geoffroy genus can be accepted as a designation for the same name when it is dated from some other author.

8. The change of date and authorship would mean that a different species might be eligible for fixation as type species, with a possible change of concept that would set in motion some confusing changes. For example, if *Bibio* Geoffroy is eliminated, the next use of *Bibio* appears to be¹ that of Fabricius (1775, *Systema Entomologiae* : 756-759), in which the fourteen included species are now scattered among much younger genera in the three families STRATIOMYIDAE, THEREVIDAE, and BOMBYLIIDAE. The generic name *Bibio* would thus supplant the name of some genus in another family. The fate of the family name BIBIONIDAE would no doubt be an argument in itself, but it certainly could not remain the BIBIONIDAE as we know the family today. *Volucella* offers another example, for the first valid use subsequent to Geoffroy (not counting references in specific synonymies) seems to be (1) that of Fabricius (1794, *Entomologia systematica* 4 : 412-413), who used *Volucella* (note the difference in spelling!) for three species, all now placed in the genus *Usia* Latreille, 1804, in the family BOMBYLIIDAE. Thus the name *Volucella* (and subfamily VOLUCELLINAE) would disappear from the SYRPHIDAE where it has long been one of the largest and best known genera.

¹ These changes appear to be necessary, from our perusal of well-known works such as those of Fabricius, Scopoli, De Geer, etc. It will be impossible to make categorical statements without an extensive search of the literature.

9. The change of date and authorship may mean, even for that early period in entomological activity, that the names would be antedated by others that are now placed in the synonymy of the Geoffroy names. Example: If *Stratiomys* is eliminated from Geoffroy (1762), the next valid name for that genus is *Hirtea* Scopoli, 1763 (*Entomologia carniolica*: 367, monobasic for *H. longicornis* Scopoli), a change which would also result in changing the family name STRATIOMYIDAE to HIRTEIDAE.

10. In view of the uniform acceptance of these six names as dating from Geoffroy, 1762, and in view of the grave difficulties, either already known or suspected, that would arise from the elimination of that work, we propose that the Rules be suspended and that these six generic names be dated for purposes of priority from Geoffroy, 1762, with the type species as given in paragraph 4 above.

11. As examples of the wide usage of these names of Geoffroy, 1762, we may cite the following general works:—

- * 1862-64 Schiner, *Fauna austriaca*. Die Fliegen. 2 vols.
- o 1877 Schneider, *Enumeratio Insectorum norvegicum*. (All but *Bibio*.)
- o 1877 Van der Wulp, *Diptera neerlandica*. (All but *Stomoxys*.)
- * 1878 Osten Sacken, *Catalogue of the Described Diptera of North America*, 2nd Edition.
- * 1882 Scudder, *Nomenclator zoologicus*.
- 1902 Sherborn, *Index Animalium*.
- * 1902-10 Kertész, *Catalogus Dipterorum*. (All but *Stomoxys*.)
- * 1903-07 Becker, Bezzi, Bischof, Kertész, and Stein, *Katalog der Paläarktischen Dipteren*. Vols. 1-3.
- * 1905 Aldrich, *A Catalogue of the North American Diptera*.
- o 1905-09 Wahlgren, *Svensk Insektafauna*. Tvåvingar. Diptera. (All but *Stomoxys*).
- 1910 Coquillett, *The Type Species of the North American Genera of Diptera*.
- o 1925 Johnson, *Fauna of New England* 15. List of Diptera or Two-Winged Flies.
- 1926-39 Schulze and Kükenthal, *Nomenclator Animalium Generum et Subgenerum*.
- o 1928 Johannsen, in Leonard, *A List of the Insects of New York*.
- o 1934 Curran, *The Families and Genera of North American Diptera*. (All but *Bibio*, which is credited to Latreille.)
- * 1936 Enderlein, *Die Tierwelt Mitteleuropas*, Band 6, Teil 3, Lief. 2, Abt. 16 (Diptera).
- o 1938 Brimley, *The Insects of North Carolina*.
- 1939-40 Neave, *Nomenclator zoologicus*, vols. 1 and 3.
- 1945 Kloet and Hincks, *A Check List of the British Insects*.
- o 1946 Stuardo, O., *Catalogo de los Dipteros de Chile*. (All but *Bibio*.)

12. Examples of the specialised publications that have used these names are as follows:—

(i) *Stratiomys* (Sometimes emended to *Stratiomyia*)

- ! 1851 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera 1: 13. (Date given as 1784.)
- * 1895 Johnson, *Trans. Amer. ent. Soc.* 22: 227.
- o 1907 Lundbeck, *Diptera danica*, Part 1, p. 40.
- * 1907 Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* 1: 125.
- * 1909 Verrall, *British Flies* 5: 146.
- o 1917 Malloch, *Bull. Illinois State Lab. nat. Hist.* 12: 318.
- * 1920 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, Diptera Brachycera 1: 58. (It is interesting to note that the editor, Shipley, appended the following note: "In this work Geoffroy did not accept the binary system of nomenclature upon which all modern zoological classification is based ;

it has therefore been ruled that all generic names therein proposed by him are just as invalid as pre-Linnaean names. The authorship of *Stratiomys* should thus be attributed to Fabricius.")

- * 1923 Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **25** : 115.
- ! 1927 Curran, *Trans. Roy Soc. Canada*, **1927** Sec. V, p. 199. (As *Stratiomys* Latreille.)
- o 1930 Aubertin, *Dipt. Patagonia & S. Chile*, Part 5, fasc. 2, p. 97.
- * 1938 Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. **4**, Fam. 18, p. 47.

(ii) Stomoxys

- 1909 Austen, *African Blood-Sucking Flies*, p. 141.
- o 1911 Schnabl and Dziedzicki, *Die Anthomyiden*, p. 125.
- * 1919 Stein, *Die Anthomyidengattungen der Welt*, . . ., Archiv. Naturgesch. A 1, **83**, (1) : 102.
- o 1923 Séguy, *Faune de France*, Diptères, Anthomyides, p. 342.
- * 1928 Karl, *Die Tierwelt Deutschlands*, Teil **13**, Dipt. II, Muscidae, p. 14.
- 1932 Malloch, *Exotic Muscaridae* **36** (World revision of Muscidae, Stomoxydinae), Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. (10) **9** : 381.
- * 1937 Séguy, in Wytsman, *Genera Insectorum*, fasc. **205**, Diptera, Muscidae, p. 423.
- * 1939 Zumpt, *Das System der Stomoxydinae*, Verh. VII. Internat. Kongr. Ent. **3** : 1732.
- o 1948 James, *The Flies That Cause Myiasis in Man*, U.S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. **631** : 132.
- * 1950 Miller, *Catalogue of the Diptera of the New Zealand Subregion*, p. 125.
- * 1950 Zumpt, *Key to the Stomoxydinae of the Ethiopian Region*, Anais do Inst. Med. Trop. **7** : 401.
- * 1951 Zimin, Muscidae, in *Fauna U.S.S.R.*, **18** (4) : 249.

(iii) Volucella

- ! 1851 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera **1** : 260 (Date given as 1776).
- * 1886 Williston, *Synopsis of North American Syrphidae*, p. 134.
- 1891 Williston, *Biologia centrali-americana*, Diptera **3** : 43.
- * 1901 Verrall, *British Flies* **8** : 482.
- o 1916 Lundbeck, *Diptera danica* **5** : 395.
- * 1923 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, Diptera **3** : 144.
- o 1928 Curran, *J. Fed. Malay States Museum* **14** : 160.
- * 1930 Shriaki, *Mem. Fac. Sci. Agric. Taihoku Imp. Univ.* **1** : 213.
- * 1930 Curran, *Amer. Mus. Novitates* **413** : 6.
- * 1932 Sack, in Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. **4**, Fam. **31** : 241.
- * 1933 Shannon and Aubertin, *Dipt. Patagonia & S. Chile*, Pt. **6**, fasc. 3, p. 167.
- 1949 Hull, *Trans. zool. Soc. Lond.* **26** : 347.

(iv) Nemotelus

- ! 1851 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera **1** : 25. (Date given as 1784.)
- o 1907 Lundbeck, *Diptera danica*, part 1, p. 23.
- * 1907 Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **1** : 117.
- * 1909 Verrall, *British Flies* **5** : 113.
- o 1917 Malloch, *Bull. Illinois State Lab. nat. Hist.* **12** : 318.
- * 1923 Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **25** : 87.
- o 1927 Curran, *Trans. Roy Soc. Canada*, **1927** Sec. V, p. 223

- o 1930 Aubertin, *Dipt. Patagonia & S. Chile*, pt. 5, fasc. 2, p. 97 (in key).
 * 1938 Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. 4, Fam. 18, p. 107.

(v) Scatopse

- * 1856 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera 3 : 140.
 * 1912 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, p. 179.
 * 1916 Melander, "The Dipterous Family Scatopsidae," *State College of Washington Expt. Sta. Bull.* 130 : 6.
 o 1921 McAtee, "District of Columbia Diptera," *Scatopsidae*, *Proc. Ent. Soc. Washington* 23 : 121.
 o 1925 Edwards, "A Synopsis of British Bibionidae and Scatopsidae," *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 12 : 268.
 o 1928 Duda, *Beitrag zur Kenntnis der aussereuropäischen Scatopsiden*, *Knowia* 7 : 259.
 o 1929 Duda, in Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. 2, Fam. 5, Scatopsidae, p. 9.
 o 1948 Hennig, *Die Larrenformen der Dipteren* 1 : 90.

(vi) Bibio

- * 1856 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera 3 : 134.
 o 1859 Bellardi, *Saggio di Ditterologia Messicana* 1 : 16.
 1886 Osten Sacken, *Biologia centrali-americana*, Diptera 1 : 3.
 * 1912 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, p. 166.
 o 1921 McAtee, "Notes on Nearctic bibionid flies," *Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.* 60 (11) : 6.
 o 1925 Edwards, "A Synopsis of British Bibionidae and Scatopsidae," *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 12 : 266.
 * 1930 Duda, in Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. 2, Fam. 4, Bibionidae, p. 38.
 * 1945 Hardy, "Revision of Nearctic Bibionidae . . ." *Kansas Univ. Sci. Bul.* 30 : 444.

13. The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is therefore that it should :—

- (1) use its Plenary Powers to validate the under-mentioned generic names with the type species specified below :—

Name of genus	Type species
(a) <i>Stratiomys</i> Geoffroy, 1762, <i>Hist. abrég. Ins. Env.</i> <i>Paris</i> 2 : 449, 475 (gender : feminine)	<i>Musca chamaeleon</i> Linnaeus, 1758, <i>Syst. Nat.</i> (ed. 10) 1 : 589
(b) <i>Stomoxys</i> Geoffroy, 1762, <i>ibid.</i> 2 : 449, 538 (gender : feminine)	<i>Conops calcitrans</i> Linnaeus, 1758, <i>Syst. Nat.</i> (ed. 10) 1 : 604
(c) <i>Volucella</i> Geoffroy, 1762, <i>ibid.</i> 2 : 449, 540 (gender : feminine)	<i>Musca pellucens</i> Linnaeus, 1758, <i>Syst. Nat.</i> (ed. 10) 1 : 595
(d) <i>Nemotelus</i> Geoffroy, 1762, <i>ibid.</i> 2 : 450, 542 (gender : masculine)	<i>Musca pantherina</i> Linnaeus, 1758, <i>Syst. Nat.</i> (ed. 10) 1 : 590

- (e) *Scatopse* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* 2: 450 (as *Scathopse* on pp. 544-545) (gender : feminine) *Tipula notata* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 588
- (f) *Bibio* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* 2: 450, 568 (gender : masculine) *Tipula hortulana* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 588

- (2) place the six generic names specified in (1) above on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :
- (3) place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific names of the six species specified in (1) above as the type species of the genera there enumerated ;
- 4) place the name *Scathopse* Geoffroy, 1762 (: 544-545) (an incorrect spelling of the name *Scatopse* Geoffroy, 1762 (: 450)) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS "PALMATOTRITON" SMITH 1945 (CLASS AMPHIBIA, ORDER CAUDATA)

By HOBART M. SMITH

(Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)594)

In a popular article ("Herpetological Collecting in Banana Fields of Mexico") published in volume 19, number 1, 1945, page 4 of Ward's *Natural Science Bulletin* (a widely distributed and regularly published journal of Ward's Natural Science Establishment, Rochester, New York) there appeared for the first time the generic name *Palmatotriton*. This name occurs in the following verbatim context: "Commonest in central Veracruz are the salamanders especially *Palmatotriton rufescens*, a small, broad-footed species about two inches long. This species is incredibly common, generally several occurring under each stalk. Yet, before this habitat and method of hunting was discovered, the species was considered to be rather rare, for only seven specimens were known from Mexico and thirteen from all other countries within range!"

2. As author of that article and of the passage quoted, I know the species referred to is the one now recognised (by Smith and Taylor, 1948, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* **194**: 23; *et al.*) as *Bolitoglossa rufescens* (Cope), originally described as *Oedipus rufescens* Cope, 1869 (*Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **21**: 104). The specific name has been cited under no other combination, so far as we are aware.

3. To other authors it may be equally as apparent as to me that the species referred to is the one cited above, but this is true only because of their knowledge of esoteric information: they know the fauna of central Veracruz, or the habitat of the species, or which species in that area would be two inches long and broad-footed (no other is), or which species having these characteristics was known at the time of the last monograph prior to 1945 (Dunn, *Salamanders of the Family Plethodontidae*, 1926, p. 418) from only seven Mexican and thirteen non-Mexican specimens.

4. The name *Palmatotriton* was used under the erroneous impression that it was to be published prior to the date this article appeared by another author who at one time intended that it should be used for the group of species to which *rufescens* Cope belongs, as distinct from other species now included with *rufescens* in *Bolitoglossa*. That author later, unknown to me, determined not to segregate generically *rufescens* and its relatives from *Bolitoglossa*.

5. That it was my intent in 1945 to utilise a name already available, and definitely not to anticipate the other author's use, is not itself of significance, although if decision on the status of the name were not clearly indicated, intent might justifiably be considered. The status of the name is, on the contrary, clearly indicated.

6. Mr. Francis Hemming has pointed out, in reply to my query on this matter, that "under the amendment of Article 25 adopted by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1927 (which came into operation as from 1st January 1931) a name published in the way in which the name *Palmatotriton* was published would have possessed no availability, for no type species was designated for this genus. This portion of Article 25 was however considered further by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 in the light of representations which had been received by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that to refuse availability on the foregoing ground to a generic name published for a genus for which one species only was cited was unduly legalistic. The Paris Congress decided to modify the decision of the Budapest Congress in such a way as to confer availability upon a generic name published after 31st December 1931 for a monotypic genus even if no type species was explicitly designated by the original author of the generic name in question (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 72). The Paris Congress decided further to include in the *Règles* a provision making it clear that a nominal genus established with only one cited species is to be treated as a monotypical genus (1950, *ibid* **4**: 153). We see therefore that under the *Règles* the generic name *Palmatotriton* must be regarded as having been validly published—though inadvertently and in an irregular manner—as from Smith, 1945, for it was provided with an 'indication' for the purposes of Article 25 by having been published with an 'indicated' type species (by monotypy). It is true that no author's name was cited for the species indicated as type species under the name *Palmatotriton rufescens* and that a certain amount of specialised knowledge is necessary in order to identify that species with the nominal species *Oedipus rufescens* Cope, 1869, but this cannot be held out as an argument against the availability of the generic name *Palmatotriton*, for zoological literature abounds with instances of generic names—some of them extremely well-known names in very common use—which were published with cited species for which no author's names were given by the original author of the name. Moreover, it is impossible to point to any provision in the *Règles* which would give any colour to the contention that a generic name so published does not possess availability."

7. In the foregoing circumstances the name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, cannot legitimately be regarded either as a *nomen nudum* or as a *nomen dubium*. On the other hand, the name was published inadvertently and it could not fail to give rise to confusion if it were permitted to retain availability for nomenclatorial purposes. It is accordingly recommended that, in order to avoid this undesirable situation from arising, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its Plenary Powers to suppress this name altogether. This name would then become available for use by any later author either as the name for a genus containing *Oedipus rufescens* Cope or in any other sense. It is suggested also that it would be convenient to take the present opportunity to place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *rufescens* Cope, 1869, as published in the binominal combination *Oedipus rufescens*, that name being the oldest available specific name of an extremely common and well-known species of salamander.

3. The proposal now submitted is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

- (1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (2) place the name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) place the specific name *rufescens* Cope, 1869, as published in the binominal combination *Oedipus rufescens*, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE (i) A NEOTYPE FOR THE NOMINAL SPECIES "AMMONITES MAMMILLATUS" SCHLOTHEIM, 1813, AND (ii) A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENUS "DOUVILLEICERAS" DE GROSSOUVRE, 1893 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By R. CASEY

(Geological Survey and Museum, London)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.) 631)

The present application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deals with the problem raised by *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813. It was originally submitted in accordance with the extension of the Plenary Powers granted to the Commission by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948 for the purpose of determining how the *Règles* should be applied in cases where it was doubtful to what species a given name should be held to apply (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 324). Since the Copenhagen Congress of 1953, this application has been re-written as a request for the designation of a neotype for the foregoing species. It is important for palaeontological and stratigraphical nomenclature that the name of the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, should be stabilised in the sense in which it is now almost universally applied. It is particularly hoped that the International Commission will give this application all practicable priority, as a decision on it is urgently required in connection with the preparation of the forthcoming *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*.

2. *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim is the type species of the genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (on which is based the family DOUVILLEICERATIDAE Parona and Bonarelli) and the name *Douvilleiceras mammillatum* connotes one of the most familiar and important index fossils in Cretaceous stratigraphy. The Mammillatum Zone is world-wide and in using the term we follow the practice of four generations of geologists and stratigraphers. Yet, as is shown below, if the *Règles* are permitted to pursue the normal course, the name *D. mammillatum* would be virtually abandoned, the genus *Douvilleiceras* would remain forever taxonomically inassessable, and an unfamiliar zonal terminology would supplant the well-known "Mammillatum Zone."

3. When proposing the combination *Ammonites mammillatus*, Schlotheim (1813: 111) did not himself illustrate or describe the species but referred to a figure in Walch (1774: 196, pl. ii, fig. 3). This indication renders the name available, and in so far as I have been unable to trace a use of the combination *Ammonites mammillatus* prior to that of Schlotheim, or any earlier indication for the original of the Walch figure in question, the name is an available name and the oldest such name for the species in question.

4. Unfortunately, Walch's figure is defective in three respects: (a) It depicts a nucleus or an immature specimen, (b) it shows the specimen in side view only, and (c) it falls far short of what is required by modern standards of illustration. Owing to these facts, it is not possible to determine with certainty the taxonomic species represented by Walch's figure. Hyatt (1903 : 108) observed that "The figure given by Walch seems to apply to the young of the form usually cited by authors as *mammillaris* and figured by d'Orbigny under this revised name." In Spath's view "Walch's original figure . . . may be identical with the distantly ribbed *D. inaequinodum* (Quenstedt)" (Spath, 1923 : 67). To Breistroffer (1947 : 64) Walch's figure "appears to represent a specimen from the Ardennes analogous to *D. orbigny* Hyatt." In my opinion, the figure in question was probably based on one of the coarsely ribbed species of *Douvilleiceras*, such as *D. inaequinodum* (Quenstedt), *D. orbigny* Hyatt, or *D. baylei* Spath, but I consider it unsafe to assume this: alternatively it could represent a member of the MANTELLICERATIDAE.

5. The original of Walch's figure is of unknown provenance, and, if it still exists, its present whereabouts are not known.

6. For over a century palaeontologists have ignored Walch's figure and have based their conception of *Ammonites mammillatus* on figures supplied by later authors. Chief among these are the two plates of ammonites depicted in d'Orbigny's *Paléontologie française* (1841 : pls. 72-3) under the name *A. mammillaris* (an unjustified emendation of *A. mammillatus*). D'Orbigny's interpretation of Schlotheim's species was very broad and his figured examples of "*A. mammillaris*" (with which he synonymised *A. monile* Sowerby (J.), 1816) have since been referred to several distinct species of *Douvilleiceras*. This broad interpretation of *A. mammillatus* was current throughout most of the nineteenth century, but towards its close Parona and Bonarelli adopted the name *D. inaequinodum* (= *A. monile inaequinodum* Quenstedt, 1849) for the coarsely ribbed species of *Douvilleiceras*, such as illustrated in d'Orbigny's plate 73, restricting the name *D. mammillatum* to the forms with more closely spaced ribs, of which the originals of d'Orbigny's plate 72 and J. Sowerby's *A. monile* provided examples (Parona and Bonarelli, 1897 : 95). Zittel in 1895 (: 429, fig. 429) had already chosen a specimen of this latter group to illustrate *D. "mammillare"* and his figure, generalised but in agreement with *D. mammillatum* in its current conception, has been reproduced in all the many editions and translations of his well-known text-book. To this restriction of d'Orbigny's comprehensive *A. "mammillaris"*, Hyatt (1903 : 109) and Jacob (1907 : 370) added their authority.

7. De Grossouvre designated "*A. mamillaris*"[sic.] [*recte A. mammillatus*], without an attached author's name, as the type species of his nominal genus *Douvilleiceras*, and the suture-line alone was figured (de Grossouvre, 1893 : 23, 26). Hence there is no published evidence to show in what taxonomic sense de Grossouvre used the specific name *A. mammillatus*. Fortunately, specimens of *Douvilleiceras* formerly in de Grossouvre's collection and labelled by him are preserved both in the British Museum (Natural History) and in the Sedgwick Museum at Cambridge and inspection of these shows clearly that his interpretation of *A. mammillatus* agreed with that of Parona and Bonarelli.

8. Thus, the use of *A. mammillatus* for the closely ribbed *Douvilleiceras*, rather than for the coarsely ribbed species to which Walch's original probably belonged, had become established even before the present century. In his monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea Spath wrote: "It seems desirable to employ the term *D. mammillatum* in the generally accepted interpretation of Parona and Bonarelli, excluding, however, the finely costate *D. monile* (J. Sowerby)" (Spath, 1923: 69). At the same time Spath proposed the nominal species *Douvilleiceras albense*, to which are now referred the originals of d'Orbigny's plate 72, figs. 3-5 (Breistroffer, 1947: 65); he retained only the originals of d'Orbigny's plate 72, figs. 1-2 in *D. mammillatum*. Spath's monograph is the modern reference book for the student of Albian stratigraphy and ammonitology and the definition of *D. mammillatum* contained therein has become standardised throughout the world, the species being generally quoted as *D. mammillatum* (Schlotheim), emend. Spath.

9. In 1947, however, Breistroffer, acting strictly in accordance with the provisions of Article 25, adopted a different nomenclature for the species of *Douvilleiceras*. For *D. mammillatum* (Schlotheim) emend. Spath, he revived Quenstedt's name *aequinodus* (originally published in the trinomial combination *Ammonites monile aequinodus*) and he proposed to call the zone of *D. mammillatum* "the zone of *D. monile* and *D. orbignyi*" (Breistroffer, 1947: 51). Breistroffer's nomenclature has not been adopted by other ammonite specialists nor by stratigraphers, who have continued to use *D. mammillatum* as an index-fossil and in the taxonomic sense defined by Spath (see, for instance, Collignon, 1949: 76; Stoyanow, 1949: 36; Casey, 1950: 270, 292; 1951).

10. If, as proposed by Breistroffer, the *Règles* be allowed to take their normal course, the situation would be as follows:—

(a) *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, would be interpreted by the figure in Walch referred to above, and, since this is indeterminate, the name could be applied to no other specimen.

(b) The genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893, with type species by original designation *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (cited by de Grossouvre in the incorrectly spelt, and in the unjustifiably emended, form *mamillaris*), would have an insecure foundation and would for ever be a source of uncertainty to the taxonomist. Established nomenclature could be upset at any time by an irresponsible author who might claim subjectively to have identified Walch's figure with, say, a species of *Mantelliceras* or some other genus.

(c) The family DOUVILLEICERATIDAE Parona and Bonarelli, would have a similar unsatisfactory basis.

(d) Another, unfamiliar, name would be required for the taxonomic species to which the combination *Douvilleiceras mammillatum* is now almost universally applied.

(e) The term "Mammillatum Zone" could no longer be used in stratigraphy.

11. Serious confusion in stratigraphy and palaeontology would result from this situation. To avoid this confusion I recommend that the International Commission should make use of its Plenary Powers to designate the specimen

figured by Spath in 1923 (*Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea*) as figures 3a and 3b on plate 4, to be the neotype of the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813. In choosing this specimen, I am guided by the following considerations: (a) It is a clearly identifiable specimen of the species accepted as representing *D. mammillatum* by the overwhelming majority of workers. (b) It is accurately localised in the classic Albian section at Folkestone, Kent, itself a standard of comparison for Europe; topotype specimens can be obtained in abundance (see Casey, 1950: 272) and such specimens are represented in the principal museums, both in Britain and abroad. (c) It agrees with *D. mammillatum* as conceived by de Grossouvre, the founder of the genus *Douvilleiceras*. (d) It is the specimen selected to illustrate *D. mammillatum* by Roman in his monumental and widely-used Ammonite Synopsis (Roman 1938, pl. 43, fig. 411). (e) The specimen is extant, being preserved in the collections of the British Museum (Natural History) and is thus available for study by interested specialists.

12. The foregoing specimen is in the collections of the British Museum (Natural History). Affixed to the specimen are:—

- number label "C 12491" — the official registration number of the specimen.
- " " "2710" — a supplementary MS catalogue number of the late G. C. Crick.
- green spot — indicating figured specimen.

13. Accompanying the specimen are the following labels:—

- (1) "L.G.S. or basement bed of Gault (zone of *Douvilleiceras mammillatum*): Folkestone. F. G. H. Price coll. No. 17."
- (2) "*Douvilleiceras mammillatum* (Schloth.), Albian. Basement bed of Gault. Zone of *Douvilleiceras mammillatum*. Folkestone, Kent. F. G. H. Price coll., purch. F. H. Butler, 26 Feby., 1910."
- (3) "*Douvilleiceras mammillatum* (Schlotheim), Middle Albian (Lower Gault) Mammillatus Bed, Folkestone, Kent. Figd. Spath, 1923, Mon. Gault. Ammonites (Pal. Soc.), pt. 1, pl. iv, fig. 3. F. G. H. Price coll. 1910."
- (4) "C 12491. Neotype—Casey."

14. The proposal which I now submit is therefore that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should:—

- (1) use its Plenary Powers:—
 - (a) to designate as the neotype of *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, the specimen figured by Spath in 1923, *A Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea*, as figures 3a and 3b on plate 4;

- (b) to set aside all type selections for the genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893, made prior to the decision now to be taken and, having done so, to designate as the type species of that genus the nominal species *Ammonites mamillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, determined as in (a) above ;
- (2) place the generic name *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (gender of generic name : neuter) (type species, by designation, as proposed under (1) (b) above, under the Plenary Powers : *Ammonites mamillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, determined, as proposed in (1) (a) above, under the Plenary Powers) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) place the specific name *mamillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the combination *Ammonites mamillatus*, as proposed, under (1) (a) above, to be interpreted under the Plenary Powers, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ;
- (4) place the under-mentioned invalid emendations of the specific name *mamillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the combination *Ammonites mamillatus*, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* :—
- (a) *mamillaris* d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the combination *Ammonites mamillaris* ;
- (b) *mamillaris* [sic] de Grossouvre, 1893, as published in the combination *Douvilleiceras mamillaris*.

References :

- Breistroffer, M., 1947 : *Trav. Lab. géol. Grenoble*, **26**, 1-88.
- Casey, R., 1950 : *Proc. geol. Assoc.*, **61**, 268-298.
- 1951 : *Proc. geol. Assoc.*, **62**, 95-99.
- Collignon, M., 1949 : *Ann. géol. Service des Mines (Madagascar)*, fasc. **16**.
- De Grossouvre, A., 1893 : *Mém. Expl. Carte géol. de France*, Les Ammonites de la Craie Supérieure.
- D'Orbigny, A., 1840-41 : *Paléontologie française*, Terrains Crétacées. Céphaloposes.
- Hyatt, A., 1903 : Pseudoceratites of the Cretaceous. *U.S. geol. Surv. Monograph*.
- Parona, C. F., and Bonarelli, E. G., 1897 : *Pal. italica*, **2**, 53-112.
- Roman, F., 1938 : *Les Ammonites jurassiques et crétacées*, Paris.
- Schlotheim, E. F. von, 1813 : *Min. Taschenbuch* **7**.
- Spath, L. F., 1923 : A Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea, Pt. I, *Palaeont. Soc.*
- Stoyanow, A., 1949 : *Mem. geol. Soc. America* **38**.
- Walch, J. E., 1774 : Lithologische Beobachtungen, Erstes Stuck. (a) Vom Vervengang der Ammoniten. *Naturforscher*, **1**, 197-199.
- Zittel, K. A., von, 1895 : *Grundzüge der Palaeontologie*.

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

New Applications

	Page
A request for the use of the Plenary Powers to preserve the generic names in Geoffroy, 1762, in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta). By Dr. Alan Stone, Dr. C. W. Sabrosky, Dr. W. W. Wirth and Dr. R. H. Foote (<i>Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i>)	241
Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress <i>Palmatotriton</i> Smith, 1945 (Class Amphibia, Order Caudata). By Professor Hobart M. Smith (<i>Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.</i>)	247
Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to designate (i) a neotype for the nominal species <i>Ammonites mammillatus</i> Schlotheim, 1813, and (ii) a type species for the genus <i>Douvilleiceras</i> de Grossouvre, 1893 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By Mr. R. Casey (<i>Geological Survey and Museum, London</i>)	250

Comments on previously published applications

Meigen, 1800, <i>Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes</i> : Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire. By Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (<i>Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i>)	225
--	-----